

DRAWINGS

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Alternately, the Examiner stated that the objected to features in claims 6-9 must be canceled.

Pursuant to a telephone discussion with the Examiner on December 14, 2005, claims 6-9 have been amended to clarify that the indicators are located on an external surface of a chamber body, as further supported at page 3 paragraph 0028 and by amended Figure 4 that was submitted in the Response dated August 24, 2005. Specifically regarding claim 7, Applicant notes that color cannot be shown in a black and white drawing, other than by indicating where the color is located.

The claim limitation directed to a plurality of gas storage chambers has been replaced with a claim limitation requiring an interchangeable compressed gas storage-body having a variable internal volume, also supported at page 3 paragraph 0028 and by amended Figure 4.

REMARKS

Claims 10, 11, 13-16, 19, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. 5,613,483 issued to Lukas et al. (hereinafter Lukas).

Claim 10 has been amended to clarify the orientation of the "sidewall" in that claim by indicating a radial sidewall that extends substantially the length of the bolt. This distinguishes from the rear wall disclosed in Lukas.

Claim 11 has been amended to include a limitation found to distinguish allowed claim 1 over the prior art, namely that the sealing member is in communication with an inner surface of the bolt.

Claim 16 has been amended to indicate that the bolt is slidably arranged within and adjacent to the compressed gas storage area as shown in each of the Figures 1-3 and further described at page 2 paragraph 0018, etc. This clearly distinguishes from Lukas, which only discloses a bolt arranged in an intermediate, secondary chamber (see col. 5, lines 60-67).

Claims 13-15 have been amended consistent with claims 6-9 and to further clarify the subject matter, and similarly are believed to be in condition for allowance at this time.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 22 have been allowed.

Applicant thanks Examiner for his consideration.

Claim 17 was said to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant notes that neither the current nor prior Office Actions include an identification of a basis for the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph. Per the December 14, 2005 telephone discussion with the Examiner, it is believed that this rejection was in error. Nevertheless, claim 17 has been rewritten according to the Examiner's suggestion to include all limitations as found in claim 16, and is now considered to be in condition for allowance.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 10-17, and 19-21 of the application as amended is solicited. Continued allowance of claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 22 is also requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,


MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Bryan D. Kirkpatrick
Reg. No. 53,135

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF; Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Date: December 16, 2005


Deanna Brusco




FIG. 1B




FIG. 2A




FIG. 2B



5/7




FIG. 3A